

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 9 was objected to for informality.

Claims 9 to 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 14 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Dula (US 5,738,261) in view of Underwood (US 2,577,290). Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pitkanen (US 5,454,576) in view of Dula. Claims 2, 6, 7, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pitkanen as modified by Dula in further view of Underwood.

Claims 9 and 19 have been amended to correct for informalities.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Objections:**

Claim 9 was objected to for informality. Claim 9 has been amended to correct the informality. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections**

Claims 9 to 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 9 and 19 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 9 to 12 and 19 is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pitkanen (US 5,454,576) in view of Dula.

Pitkanen discloses a foldable two-wheeled golf pull cart with a U-shaped foot member 53 to permit the pull cart to be supported in a stable upright position when in use (See col. 3, lines 2 to 5). The foot member 53 is fastened to a bent over portion of a bracket 18 at its two ends. (See Fig. 11).

Dula shows a vehicle hitch for securing a conventional pool cart 11 attached to a rear bumper 13 of a conventional pick-up truck 12.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a golf club carrier comprising:

- a carrier body having a first side and a second side,
- a golf bag having a back, front, bottom and top and being supported by the carrier body on the first side for holding a plurality of golf clubs, the carrier body supporting the back and the bottom, the top being open for access to golf clubs in the golf bag;
- two wheels connected to the carrier body and extending from the carrier body on the second side;
- a handle connected to the carrier body for permitting a person to move the carrier;
- a hitching device connected to the carrier body for connecting to another hitching device on a golf cart, at least a portion of the hitching device extending from the first side at the bottom of the golf bag.

Foot member 53 of Pitkanen is not “a hitching device” at all, but merely supports the pull cart so it can stand. It also seems incapable of being modified to be “a hitching device connected to the carrier body for connecting to another hitching device on a golf cart” as claimed.

In addition, Dula teaches absolutely nothing at all about the pool cart except to say it is conventional, and does not teach to modify a golf club carrier at all to make any modifications to a hand truck or cart at all- it teaches to use a conventional hand cart.

Moreover, the hitch of Dula would not function with the Pitkanen golf cart device as it requires an upper tube and lower tube on the Dula pool cart for hitching, which Pitkanen does not have.

Furthermore neither reference teaches or shows “another hitching device on a golf cart” as claimed.

Claim 9 has similar limitations.

***With further respect to claim 3 and 11, these claims recite as an additional element a support surface, the golf club carrier capable of standing upright when the support surface and the wheels contact ground.***

***The support surface is thus a separate component from the hitching device, and there is no such separate support surface in Dula or Pitkanen***

***Claims 4 and 12 recite the golf club carrier wherein the hitching device includes a mount claw. The foot member 53 is not a claw at all. In fact in the present specification a tube is received in a claw, and according to the present specification foot member 53 has the exact opposite structure of a claw.***

Claims 2, 6, 7, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Pitkanen as modified by Dula in further view of Underwood.

In view of the comments above with respect to claims 1 and 8, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Dula (US 5,738,261) in view of Underwood (US 2,577,290).

Dula is discussed above. Underwood discloses a collapsible golf bag carrier. I

Claim 14 recites a carrier for attachment to a golf car comprising:  
a carrier body having a first side, a second side, a top and a bottom;  
two wheels connected to the carrier body and extending from the second side;  
a handle connected to the carrier body for permitting a person to move the carrier;  
a hitching device connected to the carrier body for connecting to another hitching device on the golf car, at least a portion of the hitching device extending from the first side at the bottom of the carrier body.

Neither Dula nor Underwood discuss or teach a carrier for attachment to a golf car or “a hitching device connected to the carrier body for connecting to another hitching device on the golf car, at least a portion of the hitching device extending from the first side at the bottom of the carrier body.” In fact the Dula hitch does not appear suitable for a golf car, and there is no suggestion or teaching discussed at all in the Office action for so modifying Dula.


Claim 20 has similar limitations in this respect.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections is thus respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William C. Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940